



MOSER  
MAYER  
PHOENIX  
ASSOCIATES, PA

C O M P L E T E  
F A C I L I T I E S  
S O L U T I O N S

*Architecture*

*Engineering*

*Interior Design*

*Site Services*

3 2 8 E a s t  
M a r k e t S t r e e t  
S u i t e 2 0 0  
G r e e n s b o r o  
N o r t h C a r o l i n a  
2 7 4 0 1

P 336.373.9800

F 336.373.0077

www.mmpa.com



**Greenville Transportation and Activities Center  
Greenville, North Carolina**

**Team Visit Three: October 2, 2012**

**October 22, 2012**

**Meeting Three:  
Stakeholders Committee Meeting**

**Attendees:**

Aichinger, Michael  
Carpenter, Dave  
Carter, Jason  
Dreyfus, Troy  
Edwards, Don  
Farley, Charles  
Flood, Merrill  
Garfi, Deb  
Gilbert, Rose  
Godefroy, Scott  
Goris, Stephanie  
Hauser, Victoria

Mayer, Ken  
Moton, Thom  
Padgett, Chris  
Stearn, Howard  
Stubbs, Harry  
Thompson, Bob  
Trieber, Lauren  
Terry, Shannon  
Williams, Terri  
Woodson, Mark  
Wyly, Marsha

**Discussion:**

1. The meeting began with an overview of the agenda and introductions by those in attendance.
2. Ken Mayer reviewed the previously developed project goals & objectives. He noted they were not in priority order. No additional comments were made.
3. Ken then briefly reviewed the site selection process and screening matrix used to select the top three sites. He then asked Stephanie Goris to review the test fits on the three sites, their pros and cons, and the discussion from the earlier Technical Committee meeting.
  - a. Site 5 is still under consideration
  - b. Site 6: has been taken off the table due to cost of relocating parking and difficulties with access.
  - c. Site 7 is still under consideration.
4. Lauren Trieber from MAB reviewed the environmental scan of the sites. In summary:
  - a. No major environmental issues; historic properties and/or district overlay considerations for most sites
  - b. Additional environmental work will be needed (Phase I or Phase II ESA depending upon the site) for any site selected.

**Group Questions and Discussion:**

1. Direct rail access? Site 5 is closest, one block away
2. Availability of site 7? City needs to talk to owners more formally.
3. No one cares for site 6. Group is fine that it is off the table.
4. Greenville Utilities have made informal objections to site 7.
5. Site 7 could have private development opportunities available also.
6. Would development community gravitate to Dickinson Ave if transit center was at site 5? Unknown.
7. No significant opportunities for economic development around site 7.
8. Acquisition costs questioned- site 5 possibly cheaper even with multiple owners
9. Harry noted that he saw the center as a 20 year project. Later the center could be moved to a new footprint & maintain city services at site 7.
10. Ken- transit center is optimistically 2-3 years away for being completed.
11. Circulator through downtown? Still being considered.
12. Bus traffic- site 7 would stay the same; site 5 access to the east more difficult; (current one hour pulse, looking towards 30 min during peak hours)
13. Site preferences: slight advantage to site 5
14. Cost of acquiring: have 5 as a back-up if 7 cannot be purchased?
15. Projected growth: do we know what the transportation system will look like in 5, 10, 20 years? Zip car? More buses? Amtrak?
16. It was suggested that a real estate appraisal be done now so that costs are known. Site 5 will have more infrastructure costs.
17. The group then reviewed the visioning exercise. No comments or changes— general comfort with the images chosen.
18. Question was raised about the combination of GREAT & ECU buses- some survey responses wanted both, but many ride one or the other.
19. City to determine how many sites to review. Is there a way to get appraisals & cost estimates for each site? Tax values of properties?
20. MMP and the City can look at infrastructure costs & provide estimates.



Please notify the writer of any changes or clarifications to this summary within 7 days.

Summary prepared by: Kenneth C. Mayer, Jr., FAIA  
Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates, PA